

Hong Kong Daily Press

ESTABLISHED 1857.

No. 10,895 號五十九百八零第一 日一月一十年八十精光

HONG KONG, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 29TH, 1892.

四月

九十二月二十英年

ONE \$2 PER MONTH

HABMSTON & SON'S GRAND CIRCUS AND MENAGERIE

WEST POINT. — WEST POINT.
EXTRA PERFORMANCES.

TO-NIGHT. — TO-NIGHT.
GRAND CHANGE OF PROGRAMME,
ALL THE STAR ACTS, TO-NIGHT.

TO-MORROW.
(FRIDAY), 30th DECEMBER, 1892.

A NIGHT FOR THE SPORTS OF
HONGKONG.

A Grand Competition in weight tendered to
W. H. HAMILTON,

on which occasion there will be a great
BOXING TOURNAMENT
(Catch Weights).

FOR A HANDBOME TROPHY
Presented by BILLY WATERS, of the STAG
HOTEL, this Gentleman wishing to promote
the Noble Art in the Colony.

Entries will be received by the Manager of
the Circus, at VICTORIA HOTEL, until 4
P.M., on the 30th inst.

A REAL PRIZE FIGHTER WILL ACT AS
REFeree.

A well-known Sport will officiate as time-
keeper.

ROBERT LOVE
Acting Manager
Hongkong, 29th December, 1892.

THEATRE ROYAL,
CITY HALL,
HONGKONG.

SATURDAY, 31st DECEMBER, 1892.

THE "SONS OF NEPTUNE"
(OFFICERS AND MEN OF H.M. FLEET)
in the original, sparkling, and novel nautical
entertainment.

TITLED
"THE VOYAGE OF H.M.S.
"ALBACORE,"

IN TWO ACTS.
Giving a Graphic and Realistic Description of
everyday life on board a man o' war, including
Dances, Topical, Novel, and Comic Songs
with a chorus of over 70 Strong.

As performed over 70 times with immense
success at the Royal Naval Exhibition 1891, and
before the Royal Family and several of the
Crowned Heads of Europe.

Under the special patronage of H.R.H.
Princess of Wales.

By kind permission of Lieut.-Colonel RAVEN-
HILL and the Officers of the SHROPSHIRE
REGIMENT, who perform such Entertainments.

The Performance is given under the
distinguished patronage of His Excellency Sir WILLIAM ROBINSON,
A. G. M. C. M. G.

Vice-Admiral the Honourable Sir EDMUND
E. B. MANTELL, K.C.B., C.M.G.,
Major-General G. DIGBY-BURKE, C.B.,
Commodore H. ST. L. B. PALLISTER, R.N.

N.B.—Proceeds will be handed to local Charities.

Doors open at 8.30 P.M. Performance at 9 P.M.
precisely.

PRICES
Dress Circle and Stalls.....\$2.00
Pit.....\$1.00
Soldiers, Sailors, and Police in uniform Half
Price.

Special Trans., 15 minutes after performance.

Tickets can be obtained at MESSRS. LANE,
CRAWFORD & CO., whose Plan of Tickets can
be seen. Books of the same can be purchased at
MESSRS. NODDHAZ, Zetland Street, Price 20
Cents.

Hongkong, 23rd December, 1892.

12653

NOTICE TO MARINERS.

NO. 29 (SPECIAL).
CHINA SEA.

SHANGHAI DISTRICT.

BONHAM STRAIT.

WRECK OF THE S.S. PEKING."

NOTICE is hereby given that a CONICAL
GREEN BUOY, bearing the word
WRECK in white, has been moored about one
cable to the southward of the Wreck of the S.S.
PEKING.

The subjoined description of the natural
marks which will guide Vessels in passing
the wreck is as follows:—Notice.

The Station Island lies to the eastward of
the wreck; and the eastern extreme of Pirie's
Island lies clear to the eastward of the wreck.

A. M. BISBEED, Coast Inspector.

IMPERIAL MARITIME CUSTOMS,
Coast Inspector's Office,
Shanghai, 26th December, 1892.

12653

W. BREWER.

CHRISTMAS NOVELTIES.

Ladies' Work Boxes, Inlaid Wood.

Ladies' Work Boxes in Plush, Handsomely
Mounted.

Ladies' Work Boxes in Leather.

Writing Cases, Cigar Cases, Pocket Books in
Russia and other Leather.

All the Xmas Annals for Children.

Albums in great variety.

Fancy Stationery, Tennis Invitations Cards,
Newspaper Cards and Bill Programmes: New
Styles.

Xmas Cards: A Beautiful Selection.

Gentlemen's Dancing Pumps and Ladies' Evening
Shoes.

New Novels, New Song Folios.

WALTER W. BREWER,
Master Carpenter, Hongkong.

Hongkong, 21st December, 1892.

19

BEKAUNTMACHUNG.

Die BEKAUNTMACHUNG in den Handels-

und Kolonialgeschäften, anderwärts Bekannt-

machungen der Kaiserlichen Konsuln werden

die JAHRE 1893 durch die Zeitungen "THE

HONGKONG DAILY PRESS" in Hongkong und

"DES OPIANTHÄN LLOYD" in Shanghai

ausgestellt werden.

Canton, den 18. December, 1892.

DER XMAS CARDS COMPANY.

Hongkong, 29th December, 1892.

16

DISTRICT GRAND LODGE OF HONG-
KONG AND SOUTH CHINA.

THE SEVENTEENTH REGULAR AN-

NUAL MEETING of the DISTRICT

GRAND LODGE OF HONGKONG AND

SOUTH CHINA will be held in the MARION

HALL, Zetland Street, Hongkong, "O-DAY,"

the 25th DECEMBER, 1892, at 8.30 P.M.

presently.

Hongkong, 1st December, 1892.

18

INTIMATIONS.

NEW YORK LIFE INSURANCE
COMPANY.

FUND.....\$15,015,000

New Business for 1892 exceeds \$20,000,000

Heavy Reduction in Rates

New Plan Life Policy on European Lives

Agents in

ANHOLD, KARLSBERG & CO., Hongkong.

Hongkong, 24th March, 1892.

12652

INTIMATIONS

R. J. REMEDIOS,
FOREIGN & COLONIAL STAMP
DEALER.

7, CHANCERY LANE, HONGKONG.

Will be glad to send STAMPS on approval

to any address on receipt of satisfactory refer-

ences.

Is also prepared to purchase used Postage

Stamps & Large & Small Quantities for Cash.

TERMS WANTED.

Liberal Discount Allowed.

1259

INTIMATIONS

DAKIN, CRUCKSHANK & CO.,
LIMITED.

CHEMISTS, &c.

VICTORIA DISPENSARY.

We have now received our Stock of XMAS

CONFECTORY, consisting of Cadbury's

first quality CHOCOLATES.—

CHOCOLATE CREMES.

CHOCOLATE ALMONDS.

PRALINES.

SUGARED VALENCIA ALMONDS

BURNT ALMONDS.

NOUGAT.

JUJUBES.

PASTILLES.

FRENCH MIXTURES

&c., &c.

DAKIN, CRUCKSHANK & CO., LTD.

12651

INTIMATIONS

M. R. CHADWICK T. KEW, latter left

Dr. NOBLE'S Service is prepared to

insert Articles in the Foreign Printed Plates,

and our Foothold to Old Phials and to execute

every thing connected with Medicinal Dentistry

at rates within the reach of every one.

Address

No. 2, PHINGER'S TSBET,

Opposite the Canadian Pacific Steamship

Company's Office.

Hongkong, 12th December, 1892.

12592

INTIMATIONS

W. POWELL & CO.

XMAS PRESENTS.

TOYS!

TOYS!

TOYS!

DAKIN, CRUCKSHANK & CO., LTD.

12652

INTIMATIONS

W. POWELL & CO.

TOYS!

TOYS!

DAKIN, CRUCKSHANK & CO., LTD.

12653

INTIMATIONS

W. POWELL & CO.

TOYS!

DAKIN, CRUCKSHANK & CO., LTD.

12654

INTIMATIONS

W. POWELL & CO.

TOYS!

DAKIN, CRUCKSHANK & CO., LTD.

12655

INTIMATIONS

W. POWELL & CO.

TOYS!

DAKIN, CRUCKSHANK & CO., LTD.

12656

<h2

INSTRUCTIONS.

BROWN, JONES & CO.
AMERICAN AND ITALIAN MARBLE
HEADSTONES AND COLUMNS
in Stock.
Prices moderate. Work Promptly Done.
349. Satisfaction Guaranteed.

A. S. WATSON & CO., LIMITED,
have just received
or Steamers "BENLEDI" and "GANGES"
their first shipment of

XMAS CONFECTIONERY

Consisting of
CHOCOLATE CREAMS, VANILLA,
PRALINES, SUGARIED ALMONDS,
BURNT ALMONDS, NOUGAT, JUJUBES,
TURKISH DELIGHT, PARISIANS, etc.,
etc., etc.

DELICIOUS FRUIT JELLIES:
ASSORTED PINEAPPLE, LIME, DAM-
SON, GUAVA, RASPBERRY, STRAW-
BERRY, PLUM, etc.

CALLARD AND BOWSER'S
BUTTER SCOTCH, ALMOND ROCK,
and EVERTON TOFFEE.

CADBURY'S CHOCOLATES
in great variety.
CRYSTALLIZED FRUITS, MUSCATELS,
ALMONDS, and FIGS.

FANCY BOXES:

A large and varied assortment of
ARTISTIC DESIGNS.

XMAS CARDS

ENGLISH, JAPANESE, and CHINESE
a splendid selection.

TOM SMITH'S CRACKERS
a large Stock well assorted.

THE HONGKONG DISPENSARY

Hongkong, 9th November, 1892.

NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS.
Only communications relating to the news columns should be addressed to "The Editor".
Contributors are requested to furnish their name and address with their copy, and to address it to the Editor, not for publication, but as evidence of good faith.
Orders for extra copies of the *Daily Press* should be sent before 11 A.M. on the day of publication. After that hour the supply is limited.
All other correspondence should be written on one side of the paper.

No anonymous or signed communications that have appeared in other papers first will be inserted.

Telegraphic Address Press. Telephones No. 12.

MARRIAGE.
At St. John's Cathedral, Hongkong, on the 29th December, 1892, by Rev. Mr. Williams, Fabrich, Colonel Charles William Sloane to Anna HANNAH, eldest daughter of Mr. Edward LOOSER, master of the barque *Confidence* of Sydney, N.S.W. *Shang-hai press photo copy.*

The Daily Press.

HONGKONG, DECEMBER 29TH, 1892.

The Committee appointed by the Imperial Federation League to formulate definite proposals which might be submitted to a conference of representatives of the various parts of the Empire, has made its report. It is suggested that, in order to secure more complete co-operation in maintaining and defending the common interests, means should be adopted for more intimate communication and consultation between the great outlying British possessions and the Imperial Cabinet, and that when the provinces of Australasia and South Africa are each united under one Government, as Canada now is, and those three dominions are represented in London by a member of each Government respectively, such representatives should be available for consultation with the Cabinet when matters of foreign policy affecting the colonies are under consideration. In pursuance of this idea it is proposed that a Council should be formed, including, on the part of the United Kingdom, the Indian Empire, and the Crown Colonies, the Prime Minister, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, War, Colonies, and India, the First Lord of the Admiralty, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer; and, on the part of the self-governing colonies, of representatives of the three groups. This Council would deal with matters of Imperial defence and would supervise the appropriation of any moneys provided for that purpose by the common contribution of the United Kingdom and the colonies. It may be laid down as a leading principle, the report says, that all parts of the Empire enjoy the benefits of Imperial defence they should contribute to its cost.

In commenting upon the report, the *Singapore Free Press*, the most voluminous

ponent of the military contribution amongst the journals of the Eastern Crown Colonies, says:—"It seems that if we desire to profit by the occasion it will be for those whose duty it is to move in the matter to bring the case of this Colony before the Federation League as an instance of how the Federation spirit of loyalty is crushed, and our rightful claims for fair treatment ignored, for want of such a Court of appeal as the proposed Imperial Defence Council would afford. It seems to us that time and circumstances are fighting in our favour, and a very grave responsibility will rest upon those to whose leadership we have a right to look, if they do not take full advantage of all the facilities that now offer for bringing, and keeping, before the eyes of the public, the claims of the Colony for relief against what we hold to be the inequitable and unjustifiable levies for Imperial purposes that are made, unscientifically, upon our precarious revenues, upon grounds which we entirely in pugn." That such a Council as is suggested would be a great step in advance of the present system, or want of system, in apportioning the burden of Imperial defence, there can be no question, but it may be doubted, especially under the constitution proposed, whether it would afford much practical relief to the Crown Colonies. These dependencies, it is suggested, should be represented on the Council by the Secretary of State, not by representatives appointed by the Colonies themselves. The point to be aimed at, it seems to us, is to secure direct representation. If it were considered that a representative for each Crown Colony would be giving them a greater voice than their relative importance deserved they might be divided into groups, Ceylon, Singapore, and Hongkong constituting one group with a single representative for the three. The cases of all three colonies in this matter are practically the same and the representative would therefore be unembarrassed by any conflicting interests.

But whether direct representation were secured or not there is no use in deluding ourselves with false hopes that our burdens would be likely to be lightened. The most that could be expected would be that they might be imposed in a less objectionable manner. The self-governing colonies already provide for the cost of their land forces and Australia also provides the cost of a local marine force which forms a valuable addition to the Imperial navy. The report under consideration says "the time must inevitably come, through the rapid development of the colonies themselves, when further provision must be made for their defence by naval means," and the opinion is expressed that it would be only fair that the self-governing States should make contribution towards the cost of those additional defensive preparations. Reference is here specially made, it will be observed, to the self-governing Colonies, but elsewhere the Crown Colonies are mentioned and it is apparently intended to apply them, as well as to the self-governing Colonies, the leading principle "that as all parts of the Empire "enjoy the benefits of Imperial defence."

Our correspondent has directed his attention to this point, which appears to be in direct conflict with the position hitherto taken up by that paper. In its numerous previous articles on the subject our contemporary has drawn a sharp distinction between Imperial and local interests and has maintained that the Straits should not be asked to pay one cent in excess of what was required for strictly local defence, disclaiming on behalf of the Colony all responsibility for the protection of the coasts stored at Singapore, for the use of the Navy. Whether the Straits do in fact pay more than the cost of local defence is a point in dispute which it is unnecessary to argue at present, since the question of principle irrespective of the amount involved. The contribution of any particular colony must necessarily be limited by its ability to pay, but given the ability to pay, ought a Crown Colony to share in the cost of Imperial defence as well as providing for its own local defence, or should Great Britain be called upon to bear the whole cost of Imperial defence?

The *Free Press* has maintained, if we have understood it aright, the latter. The report of the Committee of the Imperial Federation League says the cost should be borne by the Empire at large. That is the position which we ourselves have maintained so far as the broad question of principle is concerned. It is a conclusion from which we see no possible escape in logic or equity.

When, however, we come to consider the incidence of the burden under the present system we are confronted with what is simply gross injustice on the part of the home Government, which takes such sums as it thinks fit—up to a limit represented by the total cost of the land forces, beyond which point it has not as yet proposed to go, though there is no security that it may not at some future time do so—from those colonies that can be made to pay, and allows to escape in whole or part those that have the power of refusal. Thus the West Indian Colonies, which possess a measure of representative Government, pay nothing, and Mauritius, where the unofficial members are in a majority in the Council, was allowed to sensibly cut down the amount demanded, whilst in Ceylon, Singapore, and Hongkong the full sum asked for was voted by the officials against the unanimous voice of the unofficials. The three last named colonies have therefore a distinct grievance, irrespective of whether the sums demanded from them as military contributions are too large or not, for there is no sound reason why they should not have full control over their finances as their sister Crown Colonies. Such a Council as that proposed by the Imperial Federation League should have the power to issue precepts on such portions of the Empire for its pro rata contribution, from Great Britain itself to the smallest outlying dependency. But here comes the crux of the matter, how is the pro rata contribution to be determined? The Committee of the Federation League says the method of raising contributions would probably be left at the outset to the choice of the individual self-governing States, but suggests that future developments may dis-

close a means of raising the necessary contributions upon some uniform principle throughout the Empire, by the allocation to this purpose of special sources of revenue.

"It is to move in the matter to bring the case of this Colony before the Federation League as an instance of how the Federation spirit of loyalty is crushed, and our rightful claims for fair treatment ignored, for want of such a Court of appeal as the proposed Imperial Defence Council would afford. It seems to us that time and circumstances are fighting in our favour, and a very grave responsibility will rest upon those to whose leadership we have a right to look, if they do not take full advantage of all the facilities that now offer for bringing, and keeping, before the eyes of the public, the claims of the Colony for relief against what we hold to be the inequitable and unjustifiable levies for Imperial purposes that are made, unscientifically, upon our precarious revenues, upon grounds which we entirely in pugn." That such a Council as is suggested would be a great step in advance of the present system, or want of system, in apportioning the burden of Imperial defence, there can be no question, but it may be doubted, especially under the constitution proposed, whether it would afford much practical relief to the Crown Colonies. These dependencies, it is suggested, should be represented on the Council by the Secretary of State, not by representatives appointed by the Colonies themselves. The point to be aimed at, it seems to us, is to secure direct representation. If it were considered that a representative for each Crown Colony would be giving them a greater voice than their relative importance deserved they might be divided into groups, Ceylon, Singapore, and Hongkong constituting one group with a single representative for the three. The cases of all three colonies in this matter are practically the same and the representative would therefore be unembarrassed by any conflicting interests.

But whether direct representation were secured or not there is no use in deluding ourselves with false hopes that our burdens would be likely to be lightened. The most that could be expected would be that they might be imposed in a less objectionable manner. The self-governing colonies already provide for the cost of their land forces and Australia also provides the cost of a local marine force which forms a valuable addition to the Imperial navy. The report under consideration says "the time must inevitably come, through the rapid development of the colonies themselves, when further provision must be made for their defence by naval means," and the opinion is expressed that it would be only fair that the self-governing States should make contribution towards the cost of those additional defensive preparations. Reference is here specially made, it will be observed, to the self-governing Colonies, but elsewhere the Crown Colonies are mentioned and it is apparently intended to apply them, as well as to the self-governing Colonies, the leading principle "that as all parts of the Empire "enjoy the benefits of Imperial defence."

Our correspondent has directed his attention to this point, which appears to be in direct conflict with the position hitherto taken up by that paper. In its numerous previous articles on the subject our contemporary has drawn a sharp distinction between Imperial and local interests and has maintained that the Straits should not be asked to pay one cent in excess of what was required for strictly local defence, disclaiming on behalf of the Colony all responsibility for the protection of the coasts stored at Singapore, for the use of the Navy. Whether the Straits do in fact pay more than the cost of local defence is a point in dispute which it is unnecessary to argue at present, since the question of principle irrespective of the amount involved. The contribution of any particular colony must necessarily be limited by its ability to pay, but given the ability to pay, ought a Crown Colony to share in the cost of Imperial defence as well as providing for its own local defence, or should Great Britain be called upon to bear the whole cost of Imperial defence?

The *Free Press* has maintained, if we have understood it aright, the latter. The report of the Committee of the Imperial Federation League says the cost should be borne by the Empire at large. That is the position which we ourselves have maintained so far as the broad question of principle is concerned. It is a conclusion from which we see no possible escape in logic or equity.

When, however, we come to consider the incidence of the burden under the present system we are confronted with what is simply gross injustice on the part of the home Government, which takes such sums as it thinks fit—up to a limit represented by the total cost of the land forces, beyond which point it has not as yet proposed to go, though there is no security that it may not at some future time do so—from those colonies that can be made to pay, and allows to escape in whole or part those that have the power of refusal. Thus the West Indian Colonies, which possess a measure of representative Government, pay nothing, and Mauritius, where the unofficial members are in a majority in the Council, was allowed to sensibly cut down the amount demanded, whilst in Ceylon, Singapore, and Hongkong the full sum asked for was voted by the officials against the unanimous voice of the unofficials. The three last named colonies have therefore a distinct grievance, irrespective of whether the sums demanded from them as military contributions are too large or not, for there is no sound reason why they should not have full control over their finances as their sister Crown Colonies. Such a Council as that proposed by the Imperial Federation League should have the power to issue precepts on such portions of the Empire for its pro rata contribution, from Great Britain itself to the smallest outlying dependency. But here comes the crux of the matter, how is the pro rata contribution to be determined? The Committee of the Federation League says the method of raising contributions would probably be left at the outset to the choice of the individual self-governing States, but suggests that future developments may dis-

close a means of raising the necessary contributions upon some uniform principle throughout the Empire, by the allocation to this purpose of special sources of revenue.

"It is to move in the matter to bring the case of this Colony before the Federation League as an instance of how the Federation spirit of loyalty is crushed, and our rightful claims for fair treatment ignored, for want of such a Court of appeal as the proposed Imperial Defence Council would afford. It seems to us that time and circumstances are fighting in our favour, and a very grave responsibility will rest upon those to whose leadership we have a right to look, if they do not take full advantage of all the facilities that now offer for bringing, and keeping, before the eyes of the public, the claims of the Colony for relief against what we hold to be the inequitable and unjustifiable levies for Imperial purposes that are made, unscientifically, upon our precarious revenues, upon grounds which we entirely in pugn." That such a Council as is suggested would be a great step in advance of the present system, or want of system, in apportioning the burden of Imperial defence, there can be no question, but it may be doubted, especially under the constitution proposed, whether it would afford much practical relief to the Crown Colonies. These dependencies, it is suggested, should be represented on the Council by the Secretary of State, not by representatives appointed by the Colonies themselves. The point to be aimed at, it seems to us, is to secure direct representation. If it were considered that a representative for each Crown Colony would be giving them a greater voice than their relative importance deserved they might be divided into groups, Ceylon, Singapore, and Hongkong constituting one group with a single representative for the three. The cases of all three colonies in this matter are practically the same and the representative would therefore be unembarrassed by any conflicting interests.

But whether direct representation were secured or not there is no use in deluding ourselves with false hopes that our burdens would be likely to be lightened. The most that could be expected would be that they might be imposed in a less objectionable manner. The self-governing colonies already provide for the cost of their land forces and Australia also provides the cost of a local marine force which forms a valuable addition to the Imperial navy. The report under consideration says "the time must inevitably come, through the rapid development of the colonies themselves, when further provision must be made for their defence by naval means," and the opinion is expressed that it would be only fair that the self-governing States should make contribution towards the cost of those additional defensive preparations. Reference is here specially made, it will be observed, to the self-governing Colonies, but elsewhere the Crown Colonies are mentioned and it is apparently intended to apply them, as well as to the self-governing Colonies, the leading principle "that as all parts of the Empire "enjoy the benefits of Imperial defence."

Our correspondent has directed his attention to this point, which appears to be in direct conflict with the position hitherto taken up by that paper. In its numerous previous articles on the subject our contemporary has drawn a sharp distinction between Imperial and local interests and has maintained that the Straits should not be asked to pay one cent in excess of what was required for strictly local defence, disclaiming on behalf of the Colony all responsibility for the protection of the coasts stored at Singapore, for the use of the Navy. Whether the Straits do in fact pay more than the cost of local defence is a point in dispute which it is unnecessary to argue at present, since the question of principle irrespective of the amount involved. The contribution of any particular colony must necessarily be limited by its ability to pay, but given the ability to pay, ought a Crown Colony to share in the cost of Imperial defence as well as providing for its own local defence, or should Great Britain be called upon to bear the whole cost of Imperial defence?

The *Free Press* has maintained, if we have understood it aright, the latter. The report of the Committee of the Imperial Federation League says the cost should be borne by the Empire at large. That is the position which we ourselves have maintained so far as the broad question of principle is concerned. It is a conclusion from which we see no possible escape in logic or equity.

When, however, we come to consider the incidence of the burden under the present system we are confronted with what is simply gross injustice on the part of the home Government, which takes such sums as it thinks fit—up to a limit represented by the total cost of the land forces, beyond which point it has not as yet proposed to go, though there is no security that it may not at some future time do so—from those colonies that can be made to pay, and allows to escape in whole or part those that have the power of refusal. Thus the West Indian Colonies, which possess a measure of representative Government, pay nothing, and Mauritius, where the unofficial members are in a majority in the Council, was allowed to sensibly cut down the amount demanded, whilst in Ceylon, Singapore, and Hongkong the full sum asked for was voted by the officials against the unanimous voice of the unofficials. The three last named colonies have therefore a distinct grievance, irrespective of whether the sums demanded from them as military contributions are too large or not, for there is no sound reason why they should not have full control over their finances as their sister Crown Colonies. Such a Council as that proposed by the Imperial Federation League should have the power to issue precepts on such portions of the Empire for its pro rata contribution, from Great Britain itself to the smallest outlying dependency. But here comes the crux of the matter, how is the pro rata contribution to be determined? The Committee of the Federation League says the method of raising contributions would probably be left at the outset to the choice of the individual self-governing States, but suggests that future developments may dis-

close a means of raising the necessary contributions upon some uniform principle throughout the Empire, by the allocation to this purpose of special sources of revenue.

"It is to move in the matter to bring the case of this Colony before the Federation League as an instance of how the Federation spirit of loyalty is crushed, and our rightful claims for fair treatment ignored, for want of such a Court of appeal as the proposed Imperial Defence Council would afford. It seems to us that time and circumstances are fighting in our favour, and a very grave responsibility will rest upon those to whose leadership we have a right to look, if they do not take full advantage of all the facilities that now offer for bringing, and keeping, before the eyes of the public, the claims of the Colony for relief against what we hold to be the inequitable and unjustifiable levies for Imperial purposes that are made, unscientifically, upon our precarious revenues, upon grounds which we entirely in pugn." That such a Council as is suggested would be a great step in advance of the present system, or want of system, in apportioning the burden of Imperial defence, there can be no question, but it may be doubted, especially under the constitution proposed, whether it would afford much practical relief to the Crown Colonies. These dependencies, it is suggested, should be represented on the Council by the Secretary of State, not by representatives appointed by the Colonies themselves. The point to be aimed at, it seems to us, is to secure direct representation. If it were considered that a representative for each Crown Colony would be giving them a greater voice than their relative importance deserved they might be divided into groups, Ceylon, Singapore, and Hongkong constituting one group with a single representative for the three. The cases of all three colonies in this matter are practically the same and the representative would therefore be unembarrassed by any conflicting interests.

But whether direct representation were secured or not there is no use in deluding ourselves with false hopes that our burdens would be likely to be lightened. The most that could be expected would be that they might be imposed in a less objectionable manner. The self-governing colonies already provide for the cost of their land forces and Australia also provides the cost of a local marine force which forms a valuable addition to the Imperial navy. The report under consideration says "the time must inevitably come, through the rapid development of the colonies themselves, when further provision must be made for their defence by naval means," and the opinion is expressed that it would be only fair that the self-governing States should make contribution towards the cost of those additional defensive preparations. Reference is here specially made, it will be observed, to the self-governing Colonies, but elsewhere the Crown Colonies are mentioned and it is apparently intended to apply them, as well as to the self-governing Colonies, the leading principle "that as all parts of the Empire "enjoy the benefits of Imperial defence."

Our correspondent has directed his attention to this point, which appears to be in direct conflict with the position hitherto taken up by that paper. In its numerous previous articles on the subject our contemporary has drawn a sharp distinction between Imperial and local interests and has maintained that the Straits should not be asked to pay one cent in excess of what was required for strictly local defence, disclaiming on behalf of the Colony all responsibility for the protection of the coasts stored at Singapore, for the use of the Navy. Whether the Straits do in fact pay more than the cost of local defence is a point in dispute which it is unnecessary to argue at present, since the question of principle irrespective of the amount involved. The contribution of any particular colony must necessarily be limited by its ability to pay, but given the ability to pay, ought a Crown Colony to share in the cost of Imperial defence as well as providing for its own local defence, or should Great Britain be called upon to bear the whole cost of Imperial defence?

The *Free Press* has maintained, if we have understood it aright, the latter. The report of the Committee of the Imperial Federation League says the cost should be borne by the Empire at large. That is the position which we ourselves have maintained so far as the broad question of principle is concerned. It is a conclusion from which we see no possible escape in logic or equity.

When, however, we come to consider the incidence of the burden under the present system we are confronted with what is simply gross injustice on the part of the home Government, which takes such sums as it thinks fit—up to a limit represented by the total cost of the land forces, beyond which point it has not as yet proposed to go, though there is no security that it may not at some future time do so—from those colonies that can be made to pay, and allows to escape in whole or part those that have the power of refusal. Thus the West Indian Colonies, which possess a measure of representative Government, pay nothing, and Mauritius, where the unofficial members are in a majority in the Council, was allowed to sensibly cut down the amount demanded, whilst in Ceylon, Singapore, and Hongkong the full sum asked for was voted by the officials against the unanimous voice of the unofficials. The three last named colonies have therefore a distinct grievance, irrespective of whether the sums demanded from them as military contributions are too large or not, for there is no sound reason why they should not have full control over their finances as their sister Crown Colonies. Such a Council as that proposed by the Imperial Federation League should have the power to issue precepts on such portions of the Empire for its pro rata contribution, from Great Britain itself to the smallest outlying dependency. But here comes the crux of the matter, how is the pro rata contribution to be determined? The Committee of the Federation League says the method of raising contributions would probably be left at the outset to the choice of the individual self-governing States, but suggests that future developments may dis-

close a means of raising the necessary contributions upon some uniform principle throughout the Empire, by the allocation to this purpose of special sources of revenue.

"It is to move in the matter to bring the case of this Colony before the Federation League as an instance of how the Federation spirit of loyalty is crushed, and our rightful claims for fair treatment ignored, for want of such a Court of appeal as the proposed Imperial Defence Council would afford. It seems to us that time and circumstances are fighting in our favour, and a very grave responsibility will rest upon those to whose leadership we have a right to look, if they do not take full advantage of all the facilities that now offer for bringing, and keeping, before the eyes of the public, the claims of the Colony for relief against what we hold to be the inequitable and unjustifiable levies for Imperial purposes that are made, unscientifically, upon our precarious revenues, upon grounds which we entirely in pugn." That such a Council as is suggested would be a great step in advance of the present system, or want of system, in apportioning the burden of Imperial defence, there can be no question, but it may be doubted, especially under the constitution proposed, whether it would afford much practical relief to the Crown Colonies. These dependencies, it is suggested, should be represented on the Council by the Secretary of State, not by representatives appointed by the Colonies themselves. The point to be aimed at, it seems to us, is to secure direct representation. If it were considered that a representative for each Crown Colony would be giving them a greater voice than their relative importance deserved they might be divided into groups, Cey

